DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 028 SP 005 239

TITLE Guidelines and Standards for the Development and Approval of Programs of Preparation Leading to the Certification of School Professional Personnel.

INSTITUTION Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.

PUB DATE 9 Jul 71

NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Certification; Guidelines; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; *State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

These guidelines and standards supersede those which have been in effect since 1961. They provide for three types of certificates: teacher certificate, administrator certificate, and educational staff associate certificate. For each certificate type there are three levels: preparatory, initial, and continuing. The guidelines provide for colleges, professional associations, and school organizations to form consortia to plan and carry on preparation programs. Each of the three agencies in a consortium is to have an equal voice in planning, policy formation, assignment of responsibilities, evaluation of programs, and the hearing of appeals. The process standards for development and implementation of programs which are outlined in the body of the document are discussed and interpreted in three appendixes, with particular emphasis given to guidelines for cooperative relationships between participating agencies. (RT)

ED055028

Unsol

State of Washington
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Olympia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

for the

DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS OF PREPARATION

LEADING TO THE CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

ADOPTED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
JULY 9, 1971

SP005239

LOUIS BRUNO
Superintendent of Public Instruction

GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS
for the
DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS OF PREPARATION
LEADING TO THE CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IMPLEMENTATION

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION

STANDARDS

A. Certification

B. Consortium of Agencies Defined

C. Consortium Programs

D. State Board of Education & Superintendent of Public Instruction

E. Effective Date of Issuance of Certificates

APPENDICES

A. Discussion and Interpretation

B. Considerations in Implementation

C. Applicability of Guidelines and Standards

IMPLEMENTATION OF 1971 GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

These guidelines and standards (WAC 180-80-700 through 180-80-740) may be applied after September 1, 1971, to the preparation and certification of teachers in lieu of standards effective July 10 and 28, 1961, (WAC 180-80-510 through 180-80-550) and to administrative preparation and certification in lieu of the standards adopted March 24, 1956 (WAC 180-80-280 through 180-80-312). Educational staff associate preparation and certification standards adopted September 12, 1968 (WAC 180-84-510 through 180-84-560) are replaced by these standards and guidelines.

> The State Board of Education adopted a motion to inform all agencies (colleges and universities, school organizations and professional associations) involved in teacher education under the 1971 guidelines and standards that it is the consensus of the State Board that action should be taken to implement the new standards promptly; that such agencies are requested to submit reports concerning their plans to implement the standards for consideration and approval and for coordination with the state's plan; and that these reports are to be submitted within one year from the effective date of the standards, September 1, 1971.

PREFACE

Louis Bruno
Superintendent of
Public Instruction

In schooling the importance of the teacher is second only to that of the learner. It is the teacher's function and that of those who aid him to provide access to the best possible circumstances for learning. In Washington law a "qualified teacher" is required for a school to be approved; to be qualified a teacher must be certified. It is crucial, therefore, that state guidelines and standards for certification encourage and promote the highest quality of preparation. Quality in this context means establishing the best circumstances for persons selected for teacher preparation to become engaged and involved in learning how to teach.

As the reader will discover, these 1971 guidelines and standards are different from traditional state standards for preparation and certification. They represent a new approach in which the processes and procedures to be employed in determining and developing components of preparation programs and approving such programs are set forth as the standards. The guidelines are the result of five years of discussion, study, and trial programs. Hundreds of persons in Washington who are concerned with improving the quality of education for children and youth in public and private schools of the state have been involved. The guidelines and standards emphasize a focus for program development--the needs of children and youth served by our state's public and private schools.

The Washington State Board of Education has adopted the new guidelines and standards as alternate to those which have been in effect since 1961. Under the 1961 standards many desirable objectives in this vital area of education have been and are being achieved. We believe that the approach encouraged by the 1971 guidelines will result in yet more significant improvement of teacher, administrator, and support personnel preparation. The 1971 guidelines call for a more effective utilization of the resources of all persons and groups who are or should be participants in this important effort.

The new guidelines and standards provide a process, a rational and open system if you will, for constant recognition of new knowledge, for an appropriate use of technology, and orderly agreed upon response to the changing educational needs of society and individuals. The implementation of the guidelines and standards should create opportunities for those being prepared to have more personally fulfilling activities and experiences so that as professionals they may provide better school life for learners at all levels.

INTRODUCTION

Wendell C. Allen
Lillian V. Cady
William H. Drummond

The basic purpose of State Board of Education guidelines and standards for preparation leading to certification has always been to ensure the competence of common school professional personnel.

Prior to 1949 certification programs were based on a specified number of courses prescribed by the state. Regulations endorsed by the State Board of Education in 1949 established a program approval approach which placed responsibility upon the colleges and universities for the substance of preparation programs. School districts were involved in the student teaching experience and shared with the teacher and the institution of higher learning the planning of fifth-year programs. Revision of the standards in 1961 strengthened the academic preparation of teachers, necessitated greater cooperation between colleges and school organizations, and fostered more flexibility in program planning.

Study of the current scene and appraisal of trends suggest that Washington can marshal its resources and knowledge to stimulate preparation which is more appropriate to the services which professional personnel should provide to today's children and youth, and that preparation programs should reflect and encourage an open-system concept. The open-system allows input from a variety of sources, does not lock all persons into the same mold, and encourages difference, variety, and change. The state is concerned that preparation experiences be relevant to competence on-the-job, the actual world of the elementary and secondary school student and to the changing needs of society.

For Washington State the 1971 guidelines for program approval and certification are a natural, evolutionary step. These guidelines provide a framework within which trends and changes in society and education which should influence preparation can be more readily incorporated into preparation programs. The 1971 guidelines encourage broad participation, honor the open-system concept, and decentralize responsibility and accountability for preparation and the outcomes of preparation.

To further these objectives, the guidelines and standards provide for colleges/universities, professional associations and school organizations to form consortia to plan and carry on preparation programs. Each of the three agencies in a consortium is to have an equal voice in overall planning, policy formation, assignment of responsibilities, evaluation of programs, and the hearing of appeals.

The guidelines and standards establish a framework whereby the objectives of preparation are determined; competencies in subject matter specialities, pedagogy, and personal characteristics are delineated; and entry and exit-level competencies for each stage of preparation are specified. It is essential that preparation programs include and address competencies in subject matter knowledge as well as in the art and science of teaching, and in such human dimensions as interpersonal communication. The professional must be competent in each of these areas. He is basically a decision-maker and decisions for improving learning must be based upon the data generated from the interplay among these several areas of competence.

Several assumptions underlie these 1971 guidelines: (1) the main purpose of the school is to help each child achieve self-direction and self-reliance in a dymanic and changing society; (2) the adults in a school, by the way they work and live, establish the intellectual and emotional climate for the school; (3) adults moving into schools as professionals need to experience preparation in a manner consistent with the way children ought to be helped to learn in school; (4) learning and growth is a continuing and dynamic process; (5) all learners become what they will by the choices they make, the actions they take, and the consequences they undergo; and (6) learning and growth best occur under circumstances where persons are respected and loved and free to be themselves and to become whomever they have the will to become.

Given these assumptions, the guidelines and standards proceed naturally from developments in teacher education over the past twenty-five years and emphasize the following principles:

a. preparation should be related to performance and performance related to the objectives of the professional and his clients;

b. preparation should be individualized and give recognition to personal style;

c. preparation programs should be planned and developed in a participatory manner by those affected; and

d. preparation is a career-long, continuing process.

A. CERTIFICATION

1. Three types of certificates are provided:

   a. The teacher certificate authorizes service in the primary role of teaching.

   b. The administrator certificate authorizes service in the primary role of general school administration, program administration and/or supervision.

   c. The educational staff associate certificate authorizes service in roles of specialized assistance to the learner, the teacher, the administrator and/or the educational program.

2. Three levels of certificates are provided for each certificate type:

   a. The preparatory certificate authorizes experiences in school or school-related settings designed to develop competence at the "initial" level of certification. This certificate is valid for one year and is renewable.

   b. The initial certificate authorizes school service in a particular role and allows the holder to assume independent responsibility for working with children, youth and adults. This certificate is valid for three years and is renewable once.

   c. The continuing certificate authorizes school service on a career basis and assumes continued professional development. The continuing certificate is valid as long as the holder continues in service. It is subject to renewal only if the holder leaves educational service for a period in excess of four years.

TYPES AND LEVELS OF CERTIFICATES
(Figure 1)

Types of Certificates	Teacher	Administrator	Educational Staff Associate
Levels of Certificates ↑	Continuing	Continuing	Continuing
	Initial	Initial	Initial
	Preparatory	Preparatory	Preparatory

3. Certificate endorsements

Initial and continuing certificates will be endorsed to indicate grade level(s), content area(s), and/or specialization(s) for which the professional is or has been prepared.

4. Reciprocity

a. In-state candidates:

1) Holders of initial certificates shall be admitted to programs leading to continuing certification.

2) Holders of provisional certificates or credentials awarded under previously adopted State Board of Education rules and regulations may be admitted to programs leading to continuing certification, provided they meet entry level requirements.

3) Holders of standard certificates or of valid teacher certificates issued prior to 1949 may be admitted to programs leading to initial or continuing certification, provided they meet entry level requirements, without jeopardizing their prior certification status.

b. Out-of-state candidates:

Candidates holding out-of-state certificates or credentials shall have the option of applying for certification under either these 1971 standards or under those previously adopted.

1) Graduates of institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, or graduates of out-of-state four-year institutions accredited for teacher education, who hold or are eligible for comparable certificates in another state, territory or possession of the United States, may be granted temporary certificates with appropriate endorsements.

2) Graduates of accredited out-of-state institutions who do not meet the requirements cited above and who wish Washington certification shall be required to meet requirements established by a consortium of institutions and agencies with approved preparation programs in the state.

3) Experienced persons who hold certificates from other states and have been granted temporary certificates may apply for initial or continuing certification to in-state consortiums of agencies with approved programs as soon as they are employed in Washington. These consortiums shall have procedures which ensure fair and prompt assessment of the applicant's qualifications and shall make appropriate recommendations to the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding certification of the applicant.

B. CONSORTIUM OF AGENCIES DEFINED

Under these standards preparation programs are to be developed and implemented by a consortium of agencies. Each agency will designate its own representative(s) and clarify with that (those) representative(s) his (their) authority in acting in behalf of the agency. The agencies in a consortium shall be colleges and universities, school organizations and professional associations in accordance with the following definitions:

1. Professional Association: The professional association, determined by the total faculty of certificated employees in a school organization in accordance with election procedures defined in Chapter 28A.72 RCW (or a cooperative group of such associations if a number of school organizations have combined to participate in a consortium for staff development purposes) shall have the professional association responsibility in a consortium and shall have the responsibility of providing opportunity for input from all other specialized and subject matter associations.

2. School Organization: Any public or independent school system or district or cooperative group of such organizations shall have the school organization responsibility in a consortium. School organizations should represent the interests of parents, interested citizens, school children and youth, the local school board(s) and the school administration, including principals. As a consequence, individuals representing school organizations shall have responsibility for providing opportunity for input for those various groups in developing and implementing personnel preparation policies. The chief administrator(s) of school organization(s) is(are) responsible for designating the individual(s) responsible for the school organization's role in program development and implementation.

3. University/College: Any institution of higher learning or cooperative group of colleges/universities which has or develops professional teacher education programs shall have the college/university responsibility in a consortium. Community colleges (in collaboration with four-year institutions) may participate in preparation. Colleges/universities should represent the interests of students and of academic, professional and administrative faculties. Individuals representing colleges/universities and community colleges should reflect the interests and talents of those various groups in program development and implementation. The chief administrator for professional preparation and development as designated by the college or university president is responsible for providing the opportunity for representatives from the appropriate departments or interest groups of the college or university to carry out the institution's role in program development and implementation.

C. CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS

Preparation for school professional personnel is subject to approval by the State Board of Education. The State Board will approve a program of preparation if it meets the following criteria:

1. Consortium arrangements.

The consortium shall:

a. File with the Superintendent of Public Instruction a letter of intent to form a consortium for preparation.

b. Specify the arrangements and processes it will use to:

1) formulate policy;
2) develop program objectives, elements, and characteristics;
3) gain input and involvement of students and citizens in model development;
4) implement the program;
5) administer the program, including monitoring candidate progress, reporting and recommending certification, recommending certificate endorsements, etc.;
6) conduct annual program review and evaluation.

c. Arrange for and report results of at least one comprehensive outside evaluation during the three to five years between periodic program approval by the State Board of Education.

d. Give evidence that it has the human and material resources to conduct, to implement, and to arrange for evaluation of the preparation program.

2. Development of preparation opportunities and alternatives.

The consortium shall:

a. Describe the role or roles which are to be assumed by the person who is to be granted a specific certificate with a particular endorsement.

b. Describe and state the rationale for the competencies (knowledges, attitudes, skills, etc.) required of persons who plan to perform the described roles.

c. Describe examples of the kinds of experiences that will be provided to assist each candidate develop or demonstrate the required levels of competencies.

d. Describe the procedures which ensure that each candidate participates in the design of his own program and the procedures which enable the candidate to achieve certification at his own rate of demonstrable accomplishments.

e. Specify examples of kinds of evidence that will be used to determine acceptable entry and exit levels of competence of the candidate; including, as appropriate, evidence of competence when working with clients.

f. Describe examples of procedures which will be used to provide positive, growth-producing feedback to the candidate and to the program.

g. Describe examples of the kinds of experiences and resources that will be available to staff development personnel, both school and college, to assist them to develop necessary competencies and carry out responsibilities of their roles and specify procedures which ensure that those who supervise the candidate's preparation are competent.

h. Provide assurances that the program is of high professional quality by describing program elements which ensure that a candidate will have appropriate breadth and depth of knowledge for his expected role and which allow and encourage the candidate's continued personal and professional development.

i. Describe the procedures and arrangements which ensure continuing career development opportunities for persons holding initial and continuing certificates.

D. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

1. State Board of Education. Programs of preparation are subject to State Board of Education review and approval. The State Board of Education:

a. Applies the standards hereinbefore set forth in WAC 180-80-720 in approving programs.

b. Receives notification from the Superintendent of Public Instruction of letters of intent to establish preparation consortiums.

c. Receives and acts upon recommendations from the Superintendent of Public Instruction concerning the review of requests of consortiums for program approval.

d. After initial approval, reviews and approves annual progress reports and comprehensive outside evaluations filed by each consortium.

e. Reviews and approves comprehensive studies of each consortium's program(s) on a three-to five-year schedule.

2. Superintendent of Public Instruction.

a. Approval-accreditation function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1) Arranges for on-site visitations to review each consortium's programs for consequent recommendations to be submitted to the State Board of Education.

2) In reviewing programs considers:
(a) published programs and descriptions made by the agencies within a consortium;
(b) reports of visitations to agencies of the consortium by state staff members;

(c) annual progress reports submitted by the consortium and the reports of the interim, comprehensive evaluation;
(d) reports of special visitations to consortiums which may be arranged;
(e) accreditation and approval status of colleges/universities and school organizations.

b. Certification function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction issues certificates and makes certificate endorsements upon recommendation of a consortium of agencies operating an approved program of preparation.

c. Improvement-leadership function. The Superintendent of Public Instruction:

1) assists colleges/universities, school organizations and professional associations in program development leading to State Board approval;

2) assists or facilitates communication and collaboration among and between agencies;

3) arranges for advisory committees of the State Board to meet, make site visits, and prepare reports for the State Board of Education;

4) selects each year one phase of teacher education or staff development for special study and focuses the attention of personnel in consortiums on this phase. (An example of such a phase would be selection of candidates and entry competencies.)

5) requests financial resources needed to achieve preparation and staff development objectives.

E. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES

The issuance of teacher, administrator and educational staff associate certificates shall be effective September 1, 1971.

APPENDIX A [1/]

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

The state is challenged to do more than establish and maintain minimum standards for education. To serve the people, state government must be responsive to new situations and anticipate new demands and trends. A state pattern of certification should: (1) provide an understandable way of viewing educational work assignments; (2) establish acceptable ways for persons to advance or change from one role or position to another during the course of his career; and (3) provide a basis for ensuring that people assigned to particular school roles are competent.

A. CERTIFICATION--Although the state system of certification should recognize diversity and specialization in the nature of services provided for students, the certification framework itself should be concerned with broad professional types and levels.

1. Types of certificates. Specialized preparation is needed for each area of service. Each area of service also includes a number of specific fields of preparation which, for purposes of certification, are classified as categories. Within each type of certificate there may be several specialization categories depending upon specific roles recognized by the State Board of Education.

2. Levels of certification. Certificate levels for school professionals recognize different levels and degrees of career development.

   The three levels of certification are applicable to each type of certificate. The person will move from level to level as he demonstrates that he meets established criteria. A person achieving continuing certification will have demonstrated both common and specialized competency appropriate to the certificate type and to any specialized endorsement.

3. Certificate endorsement. Certificate endorsement should be based upon specialized competence. Accordingly, it is expected that personnel assignments will be consistent with certificate endorsements.

4. Reciprocity. Arrangements are necessary to assure mobility, opportunity for continued career development, and appropriate certification to in-state and out-of-state professional personnel.

   Many professional personnel holding standard certification issued under previously authorized standards may wish to qualify for certificates issued under the 1971 guidelines and standards. Each consortium will be responsible for establishing procedures for such certification.

   Because certificates issued by Washington State under the 1971 guidelines and standards will be based on performance, it will be necessary for an out-of-state professional wishing certification under them to be issued a "temporary" certificate. The temporary certificate is valid for one year. Assistance will be provided so that the out-of-state person makes contact with a consortium having an approved preparation program.

1/ Appendix A is not a part of regulations.

B. PREPARATION AGENCIES

Those who have a stake in the nature of professional service should have their voices heard in the development of professional preparation and be able to influence or help change the nature of preparation after programs are in operation.

Participation in a consortium is not limited to the three agencies defined in the standards (colleges/universities, school organizations, professional associations). The definitions serve the purpose of assigning accountability for meeting the specific requirements of the standards and for ensuring the systematic management of the various procedures involved in developing and implementing preparation programs. Each of the agencies defined is required to involve other similar agencies or related interest groups in the processes. Actually, within the context of the guidelines and standards, consortium has three meanings:

1) For purposes of accountability, a consortium is a formal partnership of one or more colleges or universities, one or more school organizations, and one or more professional associations functioning through representatives with authority to act within parameters for their agencies in carrying out the specific requirements of the guidelines and standards.

2) For purposes of developing new programs for specific role or discipline categories, the consortium is a forum of interested parties--organized groups or interested individuals--working together to determine the form and substance of a preparation program.

3) For purposes of implementing an adopted program, the consortium is a management system of assigned accountability and responsibility for coordinating the implementation of various aspects of the program.

1. Professional Association. Many associations represent the interests of professionals; but if the guidelines and standards are to function effectively, it is necessary for accountability purposes to identify one association. That association should represent a broad spectrum of professional points of view. In many school districts an association selected by the total certificated staff according to procedures specified in the Professional Negotiations Law (Chapter 28A.72 RCW) has already been authorized to negotiate on matters of professional concern. In private schools and in school organizations where arrangements have not been established for professional negotiations, the professional association representation will be determined by the total faculty of the concerned school organization.

Identifying an association selected in accordance with the Professional Negotiations Law, or one selected in like manner as the accountable professional association under the guidelines and standards, serves many useful purposes:

a. With the accountability issue settled by definition, all professional associations can direct their energies toward developing programs as soon as the standards go into effect.

b. Associations that negotiate on matters of professional concern usually have facilities and resources for reaching and involving the professional staff that could be applied to accomplishing the goals of the guidelines and standards.

c. Such associations usually have staff or standing committees that could assume the responsibilities and the work of coordinating the efforts of other professional associations in implementing the guidelines and standards.

d. Such associations usually have procedures and/or arrangements for communicating association views with school district organizations that could be adapted to the purposes of cooperative functioning under the guidelines and standards.

Although all the needed mechanisms for coordinating the multitude of general and special interests found in school faculties may not be present in 1971, participation by practicing professionals and the coordination of their energies is essential if new, more viable and relevant programs are to be created.

The guidelines and standards provide for the coordination of staff development professional association concerns through the local education association or union, or, in cases where faculties are not so organized, by representatives of the total faculty of the school organization. Should the identity of the local education association change, the faculty of the total school organization will still be present and will be expected to assume the obligations to trainees made by the previously identified association or union.

The professional interests of administrators in the preparation of administrators, teachers and specialists are legitimate, so are the interests of teachers in the preparation of teachers, specialists and administrators, etc. The local education association or union is where these professional interests should be coordinated because a significant part of preparation will and does occur at the local level and is dependent upon the energies and talents of the professionals working there.

The local association should value and support the special interests and concerns of competing general local associations or unions, of the specialized local and state associations, and of national and international associations. Decisions based upon narrow parochial interests should be avoided. The guidelines and standards imply a belief that local associations given the power to influence preparation, will use such power to improve professional services to clients. Such associations should encourage pluralism and variety within and between programs of preparation for various professional roles.

2. School organizations will need to invent ways for parents, other citizens and students to become involved in professional staff development. Their primary contributions should be in the definition of needed professional services and assistance in the provision of the needed resources for preparation and staff development.

   It is assumed that school organizations in less populous areas may have to coalesce with other school organizations for staff development purposes. No preconceived plan for amalgamation has been created. Coalitions and consortia will grow as institutions, agencies and organizations perceive the need for one another and begin assuming initiative for bringing about new relationships.

3. Universities and colleges will continue to be a major contributor to preparation and career/staff development. Although college non-professional programs may be legitimately under the control of a college faculty committee, teacher education (professional preparation) has broader involvements, and hence, needs a broader base for planning, development and implementation.

   Colleges in collaboration with school organizations and professional associations should develop a variety of options for students: some students need direct field experiences early--such experiences make academic collegiate work meaningful; some students can assimilate theoretical constructs easily and can achieve competence via later field experiences.

   Colleges should help students know themselves, understand the social milieu in which schools function, see alternative and individually suitable styles of conduct, and test their self/career perceptions in college and school settings.

C. PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The following principles should underlie program development and should ensure a more valid relationship between an individual's preparation and the professional role he will assume.

1. Consortium Arrangements

   a. Letter of Intent. A group of collaborating agencies desiring to form a consortium and develop a preparation program is to file a letter of intent with the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The letter of intent will allow the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide assistance to the consortia during developmental stages and coordinate efforts and activities related to emerging programs.

   b. Roles and Responsibilities. Roles and responsibilities of each agency in the consortium are to be agreed upon by the consortium. Therefore, agency representatives should have authority to act for their agency or know the parameters within which they may so act. Agency responsibility, accountability and cooperation are discussed in detail in Section B of Appendix A and in Appendix B.

   c. Program Evaluations. On-going evaluation is essential to determine whether a program is achieving its objectives. Program evaluation should be a continuing process in which all participate.

      In addition to these on-going consortia evaluations, at least once during the five-year period between State Board of Education approval actions, the consortium will arrange for a comprehensive evaluation of the program(s) by a person(s) not directly involved in the consortium or its program(s). The consortium may agree that program evaluations conducted for purposes of regional or national accreditation meet this criterion.

Results of all evaluations should be helpful to the consortium in program change and development. Evaluation reports will be filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction for State Board of Education reference when reviewing preparation programs for approval.

d. Resources of the Consortium. The consortium should identify the human and material resources available and/or needed to develop and implement a program. The consortium should provide evidence that, as appropriate, resources will be shared, redeployment of resources can be accomplished, and additional resources can be obtained.

A given consortium may have adequate resources to develop and implement one phase of a preparation program (e.g., preparatory--initial phase, elementary teacher) and be unable to develop and implement another phase (initial--continuing phase, elementary teacher). The consortium may develop and implement that phase for which it has resources if, at the same time, it establishes links or arrangements with another consortium(s) offering programs which cover phases of preparation it can not provide.

2. Preparation Programs

a. Roles. Since the objective of preparation is to prepare professionals to perform, the basis for preparation programs (content and experience) should be what it is the educator does or ought to do when he is performing his professional role. Role definitions should include consideration of both what is and what ought to be.

b. Competencies. Competencies appropriate to given roles should be described and should include cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor experiences related to the educator's performance on the job in a given role. There is a considerable and growing literature describing competencies for teaching. (For example, the 10 elementary education models funded by the USOE.) The consortium should state the assumptions underlying their choice of those particular competencies specified in a preparation program.

c. Learning Experiences and Contexts. Preparation experiences should be designed in relation to the individual's assets and needs. Components of preparation programs are now too often treated as discrete, unrelated knowledges, skills, attitudes--existing for their own sake apart from individuals. The kind of preparation envisioned requires integration and synthesis of many elements into learning experiences that reinforce the individual's strengths and satisfy his needs.

Appropriate contexts for learning and resources essential to preparation need to be found or created--some on the college campus; others in the community; others in school situations.

d. Individualization. A pervasive idea in these standards is that teacher education should be "individual oriented." That is, that the instructional resources should be provided and arranged in relation to the individual's needs and talents.

The kinds, amount and duration of preparation experiences of each candidate will be an individual determination. The major task of the preparation agencies is to provide personal encounters with teaching-learning situations and provide adequate feedback data to the candidate so that he can make wise decisions concerning his development. Learning is individual; learning to teach is also individual.

e. Evidence of Entry/Exit Levels of Competence. In order to develop learning experiences which are appropriate to the individual, determinations must be made about where the person is in relation to knowledges, skills, and attitudes appropriate to his role in education. Such determinations should be made when he enters the program, on a continuing basis while he is in the program, and when he exits the program. The consortium of agencies has responsibility for identifying the levels of competence and designating or developing indicators it accepts as evidence of acceptable entry and exit levels.

Agencies should be concerned with designation of appropriate indicators. For example, the individual's performance on a written test may be the most appropriate indicator of successful achievement of a knowledge outcome. Whereas, the most appropriate indicator of successful application of that knowledge is to be found in his interaction with clients.

f. Feedback. The most important judge of whether a person has the competencies and qualities to perform in a professional role is the person himself. Preparation programs should be so designed that the individual is provided with accurate feedback concerning his performance. Feedback should be an on-going, constructive process through which the individual (1) becomes aware of his strengths and limitations in performance and (2) is assisted to enhance his strengths, overcome limitations, and develop new competencies not now possessed. If feedback is to serve these purposes, it must occur in dynamic situations with provision for continuous assessment of performance and for non-threatening assistance and support as one plans for continued development and learning.

g. Staff Development. School organization personnel and college faculty may desire to participate in pre-service and in-service preparation of other professionals. The consortium is responsible for indicating the roles and competencies expected of staff development personnel participating in the consortium program and the experiences which will be provided to such personnel to assist them to perform their staff development role. Staff development personnel should strive for the highest levels of knowledge and professional competence.

h. Quality Control. Professional educators will continue to depend upon personal repertoires of knowledge. It should not be necessary to require here a specific amount of academic study or degree(s). The knowledge requirements for teachers in today's schools surely indicate that the initial certificate holder will have that amount of knowledge which will enable him to pursue scholarly study.

The career teacher makes a commitment to scholarship as a function of his role. Providing the career teacher with the power to acquire superior levels of knowledge in a special field should be an important consideration of a quality program for continuous career development.

i. Career-long Preparation. We live in a changing society; teaching roles, performance, and competencies will also change. Therefore, staff development should facilitate professional growth and movement. Persons engaged in the education professions should require high standards of performance of themselves, realize the need for continuing preparation, and be encouraged to assume responsibility for their own development. Programs should provide opportunities for self-renewal and professional development throughout one's career.

D. ROLES OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

The State Legislature has delegated to the State Board of Education responsibility for establishing standards for professional preparation and identifying the types of certificates to be issued. Any preparation program leading to certification of school professional personnel must be reviewed and approved by the State Board of Education.

In accomplishing its function, the State Board of Education has established these guidelines and standards requiring the consortium to make explicit the processes and procedures (criteria) employed to determine consortium arrangements, identify program objectives and professional competencies, provide appropriate preparation experience, and evaluate program and participant performance.

The State Board of Education will conduct a comprehensive review of programs for approval purposes each three to five years and provide for site visitations, annual reports, and comprehensive evaluations.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction will assist the State Board of Education achieve program review and approval responsibilities. The Superintendent of Public Instruction will maintain records and reports related to certification and endorsement, consortium program arrangement, and program evaluation and progress and will serve as a resource to consortium agencies as they develop and implement programs. The Superintendent of Public Instruction and advisory committees will provide on-going review and evaluation of preparation standards and programs in order that standards and programs be relevant to the professional's roles and the needs of children and youth in the common schools of Washington State.

Any agency or individual believing its(his) rights in relation to preparation and certification as set forth in these standards have been abused, should notify the Superintendent of Public Instruction and/or the State Board of Education.

APPENDIX B [1/]

CONSIDERATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION

A major consideration in implementing the guidelines and standards will be the development of working relationships among the three kinds of agencies forming a consortium. How can three agencies function together in developing and implementing preparation programs? Functioning together will not be easy for:

1. Although each agency approaches the situation with a desire to improve the quality of professional service through better programs of preparation, each agency comes (a) from a context offering different background and experience and giving each a unique perspective of the purpose and function of preparation; (b) with unique access to or control over resources necessary to make any preparation program work; and (c) with unique limitations on the time, energy, and resources it can afford to spend developing and implementing preparation programs.

2. Each agency will insist and must be assured that there will be parity both in the power to influence decisions and in the assumption of responsibility for implementing the decisions.

The guidelines and standards require different kinds of cooperation to satisfy different needs. Since both the development and the implementation of programs is involved, the three agencies will have to function together on at least three levels:

1. Level one (program development only): involves activities leading to the development of programs for specific professional roles or disciplines. Here cooperation is basically informal. The initiative to begin may be taken by any agency, but each of the agencies should be involved as soon as possible to assure parity at this level.

2. Level two (program development and implementation): involves formal adoption of policies that affect both the development and the implementation of programs. Here action must be taken by formal representatives of each agency which will commit the resources of each agency. Representatives must have authority to act within well defined parameters. It is at this level that the unique perspectives, resources, and limitations of each of the agencies must be fully considered and accommodated as the representatives work toward finding the common ground on which policies and procedures can be based.

3. Level three (implementation only): involves the effective management of the resources of each agency in implementing adopted programs. Here clear delineation of responsibility and accountability for specific aspects of the adopted program to each agency is essential.

1/ Appendix B is not a part of regulations.

When a letter of intent to form a consortium is filed with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, it is assumed that at least one school organization, one college or university, and one professional association have agreed to establish a policy board of representatives to act for their respective agencies in establishing working arrangements, policies and programs that will meet the criteria set forth in Section C of the standards portion of this document. It is likely that there will have been previous contact and cooperation among at least some of the consortium participants in student teaching arrangements, educational staff associate (ESA) interim procedures, or informal planning activities by the three agencies for one or more particular role or discipline categories. This being so, the overview of cooperative functioning by the three agencies might be outlined as follows:

I. Existing patterns of cooperation under the 1961 standards (student teaching, fifth-year advising, etc.)

II. New patterns of cooperation developed informally through activities designed to test the principles of the Fourth Draft, through activities that led to establishing interim procedures for ESA certification, and through informal planning activities that led to the decision to form a consortium.

III. The first formal act of cooperative functioning would be to file a letter of intent with the SPI.

IV. The second formal act would be to establish a policy board for the consortium.

V. After the letter of intent has been filed and a policy board established, cooperative activities at Level one, Level two, and Level three would continue simultaneously as follows:

LEVELS OF COOPERATION

Level One Program Planning Activities	Level Two Policy Board Activities	Level Three Implementation Activities
Basically informal. Initiated by any agency. Governed by policies of the consortium in regard to parity in participation, procedures, basic requirements, etc.	Meets all requirements of 1971 criteria (Sec.3) Establishes policies governing consortium activities. Administers policies and procedures. Delegates responsibilities for implementation of programs to consortium agencies and/or to subcommittees in charge of individual programs.	Follows Matrix for Assignment of Responsibilities as presented below or alternate arrangement agreed to by consortium.

More specific phases of program development will occur within each of these levels of agency cooperation. Implementation problems may be minimized if these several phases in program development are recognized, for each may require different degrees of responsibility and coordination on the part of agencies within the consortium. The following Table outlines possible phases in program development:

TABLE I

ACTIVITIES AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CONSORTIUM AGENCIES

Key: I = Initiate
P = Participate
C = Coordinate

Phases of Program Development	Levels of Cooperation	Agency Responsibilities						Activities to be Accomplished
		P. A.	S. O.	C/U	Spec. Grps.	State	Pol. Bd.	
PHASE I-- CONSORTIUM FORMATION	Cooperation is informal. The initiative to begin may be taken by any agency. Each agency to be involved as soon as possible to ensure parity at the outset. If initiative comes from a special interest group, that group should work through its "parent" agency.	I	I	I	I	P		1. Contact all appropriate agencies. 2. File letter of intent with SPI.
PHASE II-- ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICY BOARD	Cooperation is formal. The policy board becomes responsible and accountable for all phases of development.	I	I	I	P			1. Establish a policy board, members of which are designated by their agencies and understand parameters within which they may function for that agency. 2. Procedures for policy board actions and decision-making are stated (voting, consensus, etc.)
PHASE III-- ADOPTION OF POLICIES	Agreed upon procedures are followed; cooperation is formal.	P	P	P	P		C	1. Formulate and adopt policies which will govern consortium and will affect both development and implementation of programs. 2. Designate special interest groups which are to be involved in program development. 3. Ensure that resources are available to begin program development and facilitate program development activities.
PHASE IV-- PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	Cooperation among those involved in development of program components may be less formal; cooperation among policy board group will remain formal. Consortium agencies will provide as much input as possible into Phase IV activities.	P	P	P	P		C	1. Develop role definitions and competencies from which program components will emerge and prepare rationale. 2. Determine entry level criteria. 3. Make suggestions about and/or design learning experiences and contexts which will assist the candidate to develop competence in an individualized manner. 4. Determine resources needed to accomplish program objectives and ensure they are/ will be available.
PHASE V-- STATE BOARD APPROVAL	Formal request from policy board.	P	P	P	P	C	I	SBE and SPI arrange for site visits and program review.
PHASE VI-- PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	As programs are implemented, the policy board may assign coordinating responsibility for given components to one of the consortium agencies.	(See examples of possible assignments)					C	1. Operationalize selection criteria. 2. Finalize and operationalize didactic and field program components for preparatory, initial, and/or continuing levels of preparation. 3. Coordinate learning activities. 4. Conduct learning experiences and evaluate candidate progress. 5. Recommend for certification.
PHASE VII-- CERTIFICATION	The policy board may take responsibility or it will assign responsibility to appropriate agency (agencies).	(See examples of possible assignments)				C	I	SPI issues certificates with appropriate endorsements.
PHASE VIII-- PROGRAM EVALUATION	Relationships for purposes of annual evaluations may be less formal. Comprehensive evaluations will be formal with policy board assigning agency responsibility.	P	P	P	P	P	C	Arrange for annual and comprehensive program evaluations.

The several phases of development will, no doubt, overlap. The attempt in the preceding discussion is to indicate the activities which need to be accomplished and to suggest possible arrangement for participation of consortium agencies, the policy board, and the State Board of Education and/or the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Within this framework the policy board becomes the primary coordinating and decision-making body, having the authority to formulate and adopt policy as well as to assign responsibility and accountability for specific program components to consortium agencies. Examples of assignment of coordinating responsibility follow:

EXAMPLE #1

MATRIX FOR ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES

	Professional Associations	School Organizations	College or University	State Agency
Patterns for Certification, Program Approval and Granting of Certificate	Cooperating	Cooperating	Cooperating	Coordinating
Programs for Preparatory and Initial Certificates	Cooperating	Cooperating	Coordinating	Cooperating
Placement and Assignment	Cooperating	Coordinating	Cooperating	Cooperating
Programs for Continuing Certificate	Coordinating	Cooperating	Cooperating	Cooperating
Continuation of Professional Preparation	Coordinating	Cooperating	Cooperating	Cooperating

EXAMPLE #2

ASSIGNMENTS OF COORDINATING RESPONSIBILITY IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: PHASES VI, VII, AND VIII

(Assignments to be made by Policy Board)

PHASE VI-- PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	Finalize and operationalize Program Components			Coordinate/conduct Learning Experience		Assess Candidate for Certification		
	Prep	Init	Cont	Campus	Field	Prep	Init	Cont
Professional Association	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P
School Organization	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P
College/ University	C	C	P	C	P	C	C	P
Policy Board	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C
State Agency								

PHASE VII-- CERTIFICATION	Recommendation			Issuance		
	Prep	Init	Cont	Prep	Init	Cont
Professional Association	P	P	I			
School Organization	P	P	P			
College/ University	C&I	C&I	P			
Policy Board	P	P	C&I			
State Agency				C	C	C

KEY:
I = Initiate
P = Participate
C = Coordinate

PHASE VIII-- PROGRAM EVALUATION	Annual		Comprehensive	
	arrange	conduct	arrange	conduct
Professional Association	P	C	P	P
School Organization	P	P	P	P
College/ University	P	P	P	C
Policy Board	I&C	P	I&C	P
State Agency				

APPENDIX C [1/]

APPLICABILITY OF GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS TO PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, SPECIAL EDUCATION, EARLY CHILDHOOD, AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The responsibility for determination of standards of preparation for all elementary and secondary school professional personnel rests with the State Board of Education. The responsibility for issuing all certificates rests with the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

1. Vocational Education

Standards for preparation and certification of vocational education personnel are developed by the Coordinating Council for Occupational Education as a part of the State Plan for Vocational Education. The state plan is subject to the approval of the State Board of Education as said plan relates to teacher preparation and certification.

Vocational education personnel have been involved in development of these guidelines and standards. The Coordinating Council for Occupational Education is currently engaged in a study of standards for preparation of vocational education personnel.

2. Special Education

These guidelines and standards are relevant to preparation and certification of personnel serving in special education programs in the common schools. Personnel working in other agencies which serve the handicapped may also wish to use the guidelines and standards in developing preparation programs.

3. Early Childhood Education

Preparation of teachers for young children may be included under these guidelines and standards. For some years a state advisory committee on the preparation of teachers for young children, ages 3-8, has been concerned with development and improvement of preparation programs.

4. Community Colleges

Standards for preparation and certification of community college professional personnel are determined by the State Board for Community College Education.

As noted in the guidelines and standards, community colleges may participate in programs preparing elementary and secondary professional personnel.

1/ Appendix C is not a part of regulations.